

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

PRO-SLAVERY CONVENTION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI,

Held in Lexington, July 13, 1855,

ON

DOMESTIC SLAVERY,

AS EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE, OF NATURAL RIGHTS, OF
CIVIL GOVERNMENT, AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF
CONGRESS.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE CONVENTION.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

PRINTED AT THE REPUBLICAN BOOK AND JOB OFFICE.

1855.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

PRO-SLAVERY CONVENTION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI,

Held in Lexington, July 13, 1855, &c.

ON

DOMESTIC SLAVERY,

AS EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE, OF NATURAL RIGHTS, OF
CIVIL GOVERNMENT, AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF
CONGRESS.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE CONVENTION.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

PRINTED AT THE REPUBLICAN BOOK AND JOB OFFICE.

1855.

CAGE
E449
.552
1755

CORRESPONDENCE.

LEXINGTON, Mo., July 16, 1855.

Pres't JAMES SHANNON,

Dear Sir:—Having been appointed by the Pro-Slavery Convention, recently held in this city, a committee for that purpose, we respectfully ask of you a copy of your Address (delivered by request of the Convention) for publication. We sincerely hope it will be convenient for you to comply with the wishes of the Convention, as we feel assured there is a very general desire to have it published.

Very respectfully, your obed't servants,

WM. SHIELDS,
ED. WINSOR,
C. PATTERSON.

LEXINGTON, Mo., July 17, 1855.

Messrs. WM. SHIELDS, E. WINSOR, C. PATTERSON,

Committee of the Pro-Slavery Convention.

Gentlemen:—In answer to your polite request of the 16th inst., that I would furnish for publication a copy of my Address, delivered before the Pro-Slavery Convention in this place on the 13th inst., I have the pleasure herewith to transmit a copy as requested.

With great respect, yours,

JAMES SHANNON.

INTRODUCTION.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION :

Out of respect for the prejudices of those, who think that it is improper for Ministers of the Gospel to engage in political discussions, and who, therefore, censure me for discussing the question of domestic slavery, I offer the following explanation. I feel impelled to pursue the course I have taken on this subject, by the two following considerations :

1. I am an American citizen, possessing the same rights, and subject to the same obligations, as other citizens ; and I would consider myself recreant to these high obligations, and unworthy of the exalted privileges of American citizenship, were I, for any personal considerations, to shrink from the performance of any duty, that might contribute even a little to the enlightenment of the public mind, and thus to the peace, prosperity and perpetuity of the American Union.

2. I am a Christian, and a Proclaimer of the unsearchable riches of Christ. For many years I have been fully convinced, that God has raised up these United States as his own chosen instrumentality for the regeneration, political, social and moral, of a debased and down-trodden world.

But it is manifest, that the Union must be preserved, if it would exert any influence whatever for the accomplishment of this sublime result. In my deliberate judgment, however, the Union is placed in jeopardy by the persevering aggressions of anti-slavery fanaticism on the Constitutional rights of the South ; and no created power can save it many years, unless those aggressions are successfully *resisted* and *arrested*, and a proper regard paid to the Constitutional rights of the slaveholding States. How, then, can this be accomplished, fanaticism converted or beaten back, and the Union saved, to fulfil its high destiny in the regeneration of a ruined world ?

I am free to confess, that I can conceive of no better means for the accomplishment of these sublime results than to *cure* or *kill free-soil fanaticism*, the only hydra by which, at present, our country is in danger of being destroyed. And I am unable even to imagine a better method for correcting this fanaticism, than to enlighten the public mind on the subject of slavery in its various aspects. Hence I feel impelled alike by patriotism, and the highest regard for the salvation of a lost world, to enlighten my fellow-men to the utmost of my ability on this absorbing topic. And never did I descend into the baptismal waters, or enter into the place of secret prayer, or come to the communion table of my God, with a bet-

ter conscience, or a purer regard for the glory of God, and the salvation of the human family, than I bring to the present discussion.

Indeed I would consider myself wholly unworthy the privileges of an American citizen, unworthy the name of a man, or a Christian, were I to shrink from a faithful performance of this duty through the fear of any consequences that might result to myself personally. Even martyrdom in such a cause should not appal the patriot, or the Christian.

Besides, were it at all allowable to apply ridicule to subjects involving such momentous issues, it might justly be called supremely and contemptibly ridiculous to characterize a defence of slavery in a Slave state as an act of dabbling in *party politics*.

It is generally believed, that Ministers of the Gospel are, as indubitably they ought to be, the best qualified to discuss moral questions. That domestic slavery is a moral question—nay, more, a Bible question—will not be doubted; and its defence, especially in a slave State, cannot be regarded as dabbling in *party politics*, unless we admit, *that an abolition party exists among us, and is entitled to our respect*.

In the name of reason, then, has it come to this, that in the slaveholding State of Missouri a Minister of the Gospel is to be denounced as a "*politico-religious priest*;" to be unceasingly slandered and persecuted for daring to teach publicly, as well as privately, that slaveholding is not morally wrong, and for thus defending the Constitution and laws of the State in which he lives? Are Missourians sufficiently demented to encourage and sanction such vile persecution, whether it proceed from avowed abolitionists, or from their less honorable emissaries, hypocritically professing to be pro-slavery men? If so, *they are already sold to the abolitionists*, and it only remains to have the writings drawn to complete the contract. But we shall see.

Again, look at the inconsistency of those men who censure me for discussing this subject. Rob't J. Breckenridge, D.D., a Presbyterian Minister in Kentucky, has just published, on the same subject, a scathing reply to the recent speech of Senator Sumner. Who denounces him as dabbling in party politics?

The venerable Dr. Lord, President of Dartmouth College, N. H., *despite the efforts of the Trustees to suppress it*, is said to have published recently a book in defence of slavery, a book in which he takes substantially the same ground that I do. For this act, it will be strange if he do not suffer, *at the hands of fanaticism*, official decapitation. Lives there, however, in America even a *pretended pro-slavery man* so lost to shame as to advocate such a measure? If such a one exist, let him but stand forth, and he will be universally denounced and execrated by all but free-soilers and abolitionists. And, yet, can any thing be plainer than that if it be wrong for me to defend slavery in a slave State, much more so is it for Dr. Lord, President of Dartmouth College, to do the same, especially in opposition to the wishes of the Trustees, in a free State?

Consistency, thou art a jewel!

DOMESTIC SLAVERY.

THE subject of domestic slavery, in the present crisis, assumes an importance not easily exaggerated. No intelligent and unprejudiced mind can doubt that the repeated invasion of the Constitutional rights of slaveholders by the foul demon of anti-slavery fanaticism, if not speedily arrested, will, at no distant day, *force* a dissolution of the Union. However appalling the contemplation may be, unless the aggressions of free-soilism can be checked, this fearful result is as inevitable as the day of judgment. How important, then, that we discard all prejudice, and, as patriots and philanthropists, contemplate this momentous subject in its true light,—not as a mere speculative question about an abstract principle, but, as it really is, a fixed and stubborn fact.

Slavery is found in our midst. It was forced on the South by the combined efforts of old England and New England, now also leagued together for selfish ends, in an unholy alliance, for its extermination. The present generation of slaveholders are in no shape responsible for its existence. They had no agency in its introduction; and, therefore, although its existence were admitted to be their *misfortune*, it can never be proved to be their *fault*. Its abolition, under existing circumstances, is believed to be morally impossible. In 1850, according to the census of the United States, there were in the slave States, including the District of Columbia, three million one hundred and ninety-five thousand nine hundred and fifty-one slaves. The average value of an ordinary lot of slaves is generally estimated at one-half the price of a prime field hand. Such a slave will now readily sell for 1,200 dollars. Taking \$600, then, as the average, it will give us 1,917,570,600 dollars as the total value of the slaves in 1850. The natural increase, since that time, makes it reasonable to estimate their present value, in round numbers, at two thousand millions of dollars. At six per cent., the annual interest on that sum will amount to one hundred and twenty millions.

Strike out of existence at once this vast amount of productive capital, and it is not in the power of human arithmetic to compute, or of human language to express, the amount of financial ruin that would result, not merely to the slaveholding, but also to the non-slaveholding States, and to the civilized world. Besides,

it should not be forgotten that negro slaves alone are constitutionally adapted to labor in those climates where the great staples of cotton, rice and sugar can be produced. Emancipation, therefore, would convert this vast region, the abode of wealth, civilization and refinement of the highest order, into a howling wilderness. The loss of productive property in land, houses, machinery, and improvements of various kinds, thus rendered valueless, can hardly be estimated. An able article in "Blackwood's Magazine" for February, 1848, estimates the loss in this way, in the British West Indies, as being "certainly not less than two hundred millions sterling," whilst the estimated value of the slaves was only fifty millions. Though volumes might be written on this topic, my time only permits me to suggest it, and pass on.

But the financial ruin is by no means the most important item in this account of prospective abolitionism. Look to St. Domingo and the British West Indies. In short, look where you please, all history attests that emancipation would be the greatest calamity that could be inflicted on the blacks themselves; that American slavery has elevated their character, and ameliorated their condition, in all respects; and that wherever fanaticism or misguided philanthropy has cut them loose from the guardianship of the white race, they have not merely degenerated, but have retrograded with rapid strides towards a savage, and even a brutal state. Facts innumerable and well authenticated might be produced to sustain this position, did time permit. Again, the blacks form about one-third of the whole population included in the slave States: what disposition could be made of them, if emancipated? The free States, although rabid to steal them—when, in so doing, they are compelled to commit perjury, murder, and the most unblushing and indubitable nullification of the Constitution and laws of the United States—would not consent to receive even a moiety of them, if they could be had honorably and without committing these crimes.

They could not be sent to Africa. Even if benevolence presented no barrier to their expulsion, the resources of the Union—impoverished, as it would be, by their emancipation—would be inadequate to transport them to Africa, or to any foreign land.

They could not remain in our midst. It needs no argument to prove that the two races, in numbers so nearly equal, *especially under a republican form of government*, could not possibly coëxist on a footing of social and political equality. Self-preservation, the first law of Nature, would compel one race to expel, exterminate, or enslave the other. The foregoing difficulties exist in their full magnitude even on the hypothesis that emancipation could be effected peaceably. But who that is not absolutely insane, or idiotic, can imagine for a single moment that this is at all possible? Who can imagine that more than six millions of American citizens, inhabiting fifteen States of this Union, would

consent to be robbed of property to the extent of two thousand millions, to which their rights are as clearly recognized, and as sacredly guarded, in the Constitution, and in the Bible, as to any other species of property? Would they not rather, in view of the inevitable and utter ruin that emancipation must bring in its train, appeal to the God of battles, buckle on their armor, meet the fanatical invader on the outposts of the Constitution with fire and faggot, and, if need be, perish bravely in the defence of their altars and their firesides, rather than meanly live to drag out a wretched existence, and in the end to suffer a more wretched and intolerable doom. In view of such appalling results, even supposing them to be barely probable, who but a madman, a traitor, or a fiend, could give countenance to that reckless anti-slavery fanaticism, which is rushing madly forward—through perjury, theft and murder, and over the prostrate, mangled, bleeding Constitution—to rob six millions of their fellow-citizens of two thousand millions of property; at the imminent peril, too, of dissolving the Union, or lighting up the torch of civil, perhaps servile war; baptizing our happy land in a sea of fraternal blood, and plunging in an abyss of rayless gloom this last, this best, this only hope for the regeneration of a debased and ruined world?

To all this, however, it may be objected, that slavery is a moral wrong; that our obligation to do right is paramount to all others; and that it never can be justifiable to do wrong from an apprehension of any evils, whether real or imaginary, that may be anticipated to result from doing right.

I reply most unhesitatingly, that if the first of these positions can be established, I admit all the balance. If it can be fairly shown that the philosophy of slavery is on a par with the philosophy of *lying*, of *theft*, or of *murder*, I will frankly acknowledge myself a wretch, justly deserving to be abandoned by God, and scouted from the society of all honorable men, if I ever thenceforward open my lips in its defence, or if I do not use all lawful and honorable means for its immediate and eternal overthrow. In such an event, I can see no other alternative for me, than, in my own sober judgment, to become either an *abolitionist* or a *villain*. This, fellow-citizens, is the rule, by which I desire to be tried myself. You will, of course, adopt or reject it, as you think best, in trying others.

In deciding the question, whether slavery be a moral wrong, I premise that I hold it as an axiom, *that THE Bible is the only infallible standard of moral truth and human duty*. Not desiring impiously to presume to be wiser than God—to condemn what he has not condemned, or to justify what he has not justified—I repudiate, as the *quintessence* of infidelity, the sentiment, that men are able by the light of Nature, by any power of intellect, or by any feeling “*away down in the heart*,” to prove that to be wrong which the Bible sanctions.

My time will not permit me to do more, at present, than to cast a very hasty glance at the Bible argument; for a more extended view of that subject, the public are referred to my "Philosophy of Slavery," a work that has been before the American people for the last eleven years, and which, although it has been malignantly *caricatured*, *perverted* and *assailed* with all the powers of *wit*, *ridicule*, *billingsgate* and *sophistry*, has never yet been logically answered, nor a logical answer thereto even so much as attempted. This fact (taking into account the unenviable attitude in which the edition of 1849 placed many of the first men in America, both in church and state—all indeed who advocated or *even sympathized* with the scheme of emancipation then on foot in Kentucky) I am compelled to regard as an indirect admission, that the work is *logically* and scripturally impregnable. Indeed I hardly know if it is not superfluous to delay even for a moment on this aspect of the question. All who are well informed on the subject know, that, if the Bible sanctions any thing, it sanctions slaveholding. The most candid and prominent of the anti-slavery leaders (whether religious or *infidel*) have, within the last ten years, totally abandoned the Bible argument; and many of the latter class may now be heard blaspheming the God of the Bible in terms so malignant and fiendish, as might well make demons shudder. Let us, however, for the sake of those, who have not access to the work aforesaid, take a hasty glance at this view of the subject.

Very soon after the Deluge, Jehovah, by a positive decree, adjudged the posterity of Canaan to the relation of bond servants to the posterities of Shem and Japhet. (Gen. 9: 25-27.) The position of Abolitionism, that God in this passage merely predicts the future history of the three families, but does not sanction domestic slavery, is too stolid to need refutation. Piety and common sense alike revolt at the idea that God could be capable of predicting a wicked act, and at the same time, without even an intimation of his displeasure, pronouncing the most emphatic blessings upon the wicked actor. Yet such is the reproach impiously cast upon the spotless character of Jehovah by the absurd efforts of abolition logic to nullify the plain import of this passage.

When the war of the nine kings occurred in the vale of Siddim, there were found among Abram's servants, born in his house, no less than three hundred and eighteen men capable of bearing arms. (Gen. 14: 14.)

As this distinguished captain and slaveholder returned from the slaughter of the kings, God sent his servant Melchisedec to meet him in the way, and *bless him*. (Gen. 14: 18-20.) Not long after this event, God changed his name to Abraham (Father of Nations), made a covenant with him, and *stereotyped his approbation of domestic slavery*, by engraving it on that covenant,

and incorporating it with the ordinance of circumcision. "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." (Gen. 17: 13.) About four hundred and thirty years after this occurrence, when God was preparing to lead his chosen people out of the land of Egypt, and to make of them a great nation, he gave them the ordinance of the passover, and engraved his approbation of domestic slavery on that also, as he had previously done on the ordinance of circumcision.

"And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof: but every man's servant *that is bought for money*, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A foreigner, and *a hired servant*, shall not eat thereof. (Exod. 12: 43-45.) Thus did Jehovah stereotype his approbation of domestic slavery by incorporating it with the ordinances of the Jewish religion, the only religion on earth that had the divine sanction, from the calling of Abraham, three hundred and sixty-seven years after the Deluge, till the introduction of Christianity, a period of more than nineteen hundred years.

Nor is this all. When Jehovah had brought his chosen people out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, he gave them at Mount Sinai the law of the Ten Commandments, generally recognized throughout the civilized world as the *Moral Law*, and incorporated in its provisions a distinct recognition of the principle (so arrogantly denied by infidel abolitionism), *that man may rightfully hold property in man*. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his *man-servant*, nor his *maid-servant*, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's." (Exod. 20: 17.)

The character of the servants here spoken of, is put beyond the possibility of a doubt, in the statutes concerning circumcision and the passover. They are *slaves home born*, or *bought with money*, as contra-distinguished by God himself from hired servants. Again, "If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he *die under his hand*, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he *shall not be punished; for he is his MONEY*. (Exod. 21: 20-21.) We have already seen that, in the Decalogue given at Mount Sinai, God recognized right of property in slaves as distinctly (and guarded that right as sacredly) as in any thing else. But this is not all. Jehovah then and there prohibited the holding of a Jew in bondage longer than till the year of Jubilee, except in a single case, which is clearly defined, wherein the bondage even of a Jew might be for life. (Exod. 21: 2-6.)

At the same time, however, by express statute he permitted the Jews to buy the children of the gentiles, residing in the land of Judea, and in the surrounding states, into *hereditary bondage*

for ever. “Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as *an inheritance for your children after you*, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your *bondmen for ever.*” (Lev. 25 : 44-46.)

In the light of these Scriptures, clear as a sunbeam, who will *dare*—who will *impiously dare*—to give Jehovah the lie to his face, and affirm, that *man* cannot rightfully hold property in man; that slavery is a moral wrong, and on a par with *lying, theft, and murder*? Volumes might readily be filled with passages in the Old Testament, going directly to prove that, in accordance with the divine approbation, slaves were held by God’s chosen people, and *recognized as property.* But it is unnecessary, and I must hasten on. I am well aware that there is a passage in Deuteronomy, which abolitionists interpret so as to conflict with the undeniable import of the foregoing scriptures. “Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, **EVEN AMONG YOU**, in that place where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him.” (Deut. 23 : 15-16.)

Abolition *higher-law* traitors and nullifiers triumphantly quote this text, seeming to regard it as a justification of their perjury in violating their oath to sustain the constitution and laws of the United States. This is most obviously a gross, if not a wicked, perversion of the passage. The precept in question is manifestly given to the whole Jewish nation, to regulate their conduct with respect to the surrounding heathen, and not their conduct individually to each other. For a moment suppose it otherwise, and see the inevitable result. By statutes, than which none can possibly be plainer, God had at this time stereotyped his approbation of slaveholding, by incorporating it with the ordinances of the Jewish religion. He had explicitly recognized, and sacredly guarded the right of property in slaves, in the moral as well as in the ceremonial law; and had prohibited most emphatically, not merely the violation of that right, but even the indulgence of a disposition that might tend, directly or indirectly, to such violation. Who, that is not blinded by prejudice, or incurably infidel at heart, can imagine, that God, in such circumstances, would himself enjoin a violation of those rights, which he had so sacredly guarded? Messiah says: “A kingdom divided against itself can not stand.” Abolitionists wrest this passage from its obvious import, and convert the truth of God into a lie, by forcing upon it a meaning that sets God in opposition to himself, and *would involve his empire in ruin.*

Hence, if the Bible be true, to denounce slavery as being essentially criminal, is to blaspheme God by pronouncing sentence of condemnation on his statutes, and making him the author of sin.

But does not the New Testament repeal on this subject what had been previously sanctioned in the Old? The most talented anti-slavery men in America, with Dr. Wayland at their head, are compelled to acknowledge, that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever commanded masters, not even Christian masters, in a solitary instance, to free their slaves, nor even *advised* them to do so; nor *permitted* slaves to free themselves from their masters. "Under-ground railroads" in those days would have been disposed of without much ceremony. It is also admitted, that slavery was then general throughout the known world. The Apostolic epistles abound with direct references to the relation, and with instructions to Christian masters and servants how they shall best discharge their respective duties; but nowhere is there even a hint given that the relation is unlawful, or that a Christian master is laid under any obligation, either by the letter, or by the *spirit* of his religion, to emancipate his slaves; not even though they be converted to Christianity, and have become his brethren in the Lord. We have time to quote only a very few of such passages out of a great many that might be produced.

"Let every man abide in the same calling (or state) wherein he was called. Art thou called being a *bondman*? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." (1 Cor. 7: 20-21.) "And so ordain I in all churches" (v. 17). "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or *free*. And, ye masters, do the same thing unto them, forbearing threatening; knowing that your master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him." (Eph. 6: 5-9:)

"Let as many servants (*douloi*, slaves) as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have *believing masters*, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." (*Literally*—but let them serve them the more, because faithful and beloved are those who partake of the benefit.) "These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, he is proud, KNOWING NOTHING, but doating about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disput-

ings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself." (1 Tim. 6: 1-5.)

Thus, it seems, that they had some abolition *ignoramus* even in Paul's day; and that inspired Apostle pronounced them "*men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth,*" and commanded Christians to withdraw from their society.

If this be so, then indeed is the broad seal of heaven's reprobation stamped on the brazen forehead of abolitionism in characters, than which none could possibly be plainer, or more easily understood. Not more plainly does God prohibit the violation of the right of property in the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," nor the indulgence of a disposition to violate that right, in the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet," than he has, in this passage, *stereotyped the infamy*, and published the condemnation of abolitionism.

In short, neither Jesus Christ, nor any of his Apostles, ever interfered with the institution of slavery, except to rebuke abolitionism, and exhort both masters and slaves to perform faithfully, as in the sight of God, their respective duties.

It is contended, however, by Dr. Wayland and others, that "the moral principles of the Gospel are directly subversive of slavery. The principles in question are contained in the precepts, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

Now it is obvious, that the whole force of this argument depends on the assumption, that these principles are peculiar to the Gospel, and did not pertain equally to the law; for it is undeniable, as we have seen, that, under the law, God gave to the Israelites, by express statute, the right of buying and selling slaves, and of handing them down to posterity as an inheritance forever. And if, at the same time, they were required to love their neighbors as themselves, there can not be any incompatibility between this principle and the relation of hereditary domestic slavery; for it would be alike arrogant and impious to charge Jehovah with sanctioning and instituting what, at the same time, he condemned and reprobated. And it would be no less arrogant and impious for the creature to pretend to be wiser than the Creator, and to be able to discover an incompatibility between a *principle* and a practice, where God saw none.

Now it is evident, that this is not a question of doubtful reasoning, but simply a question of fact, that must be proved or disproved by direct testimony. How, then, stands the case? By a reference to Lev. 19: 18, it is proved, that the Jew was required to "love his neighbor as himself;" whilst he was expressly permitted, by statute, to buy a Jew into bondage for a limited time, and a gentile into hereditary bondage forever. And by referring to Mat. 22: 39, 40, it will be seen, that Jesus himself affirms that

this precept involves the very essence of the law, so far as regards the duties of man to his fellow-man. Hence it can not be incompatible with any practice, which that law instituted, or sanctioned.

To the *unprejudiced* mind, possessing even ordinary intelligence, the true meaning of those precepts is obvious: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," can not possibly signify more than, that we should pay the same regard to HIS RIGHTS, that we desire him to pay to OURS. It does not define what *those rights* are, but leaves that matter to be ascertained wholly from other, and independent sources. So also, "Do to others as you would that they should do unto you," means simply—Do to others what, were you in *their* circumstances, it would be reasonable and proper for you to *desire*, that they should do unto you. The anti-slavery interpretation of this passage is, most evidently, both absurd and wicked. It makes the *erring* and *sinful* desires of selfish and wicked men the standard of duty, instead of God's *unerring* and inspired word. According to that interpretation, if A desires B to aid him in an infernal plot of seduction, theft, or murder, it becomes immediately his duty to aid B in a similar plot, if B is sufficiently a villain to desire his co-operation. I am amazed, that such men as Wayland and Chalmers should suffer their intellect to be so blinded by prejudice as to advocate an interpretation of these passages necessarily involving conclusions so horrible. Can there be better evidence, that prejudice is a torpedo, whose touch benumbs and paralyzes the most gigantic intellect?

I regard it, therefore, as proved beyond the possibility of a doubt, that, if slavery can be shown to be morally wrong, the Bible is thereby demonstrated to be a *cheat*.

But is not slavery opposed to natural rights, which are inalienable? I reply, that the laws of Nature are the laws of God as really as those promulgated in the Bible. Hence there can be no better evidence, that we *misinterpret* Nature, than the fact, that we draw from her teaching an inference at variance with plain Scripture doctrine. None but an infidel can deny this conclusion. With this single remark I might reasonably dispose of this specious objection, but for the sake of proving how utterly untenable is this, the very strongest of all the strongholds of abolitionism, I will examine for a little the alleged incompatibility of slavery with natural rights.

The relation of master and slave is merely that of debtor and creditor extended—namely, TO SERVICE FOR LIFE. The relation of debtor and creditor is a relation rightfully subsisting between moral agents, and no man, except a knave or a simpleton, will affirm, that this relation is incompatible with the laws of Nature. But if a human being can *owe service* for a year, and be rightfully compelled to *pay* it, he can for fifty years, or *for life*.

The only conceivable objection to this view is, that a man can not be thus bound without his own consent. To this objection I

reply very briefly, that moral obligation depends wholly on the relation *rightfully* subsisting between moral agents, whether with or without the consent of the parties. A few examples will establish this position beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt.

Children are brought into the filial relation *without* their consent; yet even Wayland admits that, "by the law of Nature," they owe their parents service "for so long a period as may be sufficient to secure an adequate remuneration" for the cost of raising; and that "this right he," the parent, "may, if he see fit, transfer to another, as in the case of apprenticeship."

Again: The human family became God's accountable creatures without their own consent; yet are they his (*douloi*) slaves, owe him service for *life*, and can never exhaust their indebtedness. And the highest dignity to which they can attain in this life is to be faithful (*douloi*) slaves—BOND-SERVANTS, *not* hirelings, of the Lord Jehovah.

This relation, too, when properly contemplated, is much more independent, dignified and endearing than that of hireling. There is an identity of interest, and there frequently is, and always should be, one of sympathy, between master and slave; but no such identity exists between *master* and *hireling*.

The master of a slave knows and feels, that he is bound to protect that slave from all possible harm, to supply all his reasonable wants while living, and to bury him decently when dead; and that his whole estate, even if he be a millionaire, together with his own personal energies, are legally as well as morally bound for the faithful performance of these duties, although that slave should never be able to render him compensation to the value of a single cent. The slave knows this, and that, if he have a good master, he need not be troubled about these things, but attend faithfully, when able, to the performance of reasonable service, and his necessary wants will all be supplied.

It must not be forgotten or overlooked, that the relations of master and slave are correlative, and the duties of these relations reciprocal. Both legally and morally, the master as truly belongs to the slave for the performance of a master's duties, as the slave belongs to the master for the performance (*when able*) of a slave's duties. In this respect, each may with equal propriety be said to own the other. Hence, in decrepitude from sickness or old age, the slave can say, "I have all things and abound." "I own a master, whose whole estate, and whose own personal energies are pledged for my support." The slave is, therefore, independent and happy.

Not so the poor hireling, who is wholly dependent on his daily labor for his daily bread. In sickness or old age, and often at other times, his only prospect is starvation, or the repulsive charity of a selfish and often heartless world.

In the very nature of things, then, no such identity of interest

or sympathy of feeling can possibly exist between the master and the *hired* servant, as we have seen to exist between master and slave. On the contrary, the relation of master and hired servant is purely mercenary, and the interests of the two parties *antagonistic* rather than identical. Each is impelled continually by selfishness to obtain the greatest possible amount, whether of service, or of hire, for the least possible equivalent. This thought is capable of being indefinitely extended and elaborated did time permit; but it does not, and I must hasten on.

Again: The Son of God, by his death, as a sin-offering, became, in a very important sense, "the Saviour of all men," and thus established a relation *without their consent*, by virtue of which they are justly held obligated as slaves—not *hirelings*—to serve him with all their faculties as long as they exist, doing not their own will, but his, in every thing. And if they refuse to render this service, they can be justly punished.

It is, therefore, self-evidently absurd, and directly subversive of the highest moral obligations in the universe—those that bind man to the throne of the Eternal, and of his Son Jesus Christ—to affirm that an individual can not, by the law of Nature, be rightfully bound, *without his own consent*, to render service for life.

Again: Two men, A and B, are thrown, by accident, on a lonely island. A assails B with an avowed purpose of killing him. In such circumstances, B has an undoubted *natural right* to take the life of A, to save his own. Much more has he a right to commute this penalty for the lesser evil of making him his slave for life.

The same reasoning will apply to communities as well as to individuals. And thus originated the natural right—in ancient times universally recognized—to make slaves of captives taken in war. It was a merciful commutation of the right to put them to death under the paramount law of self-preservation. In Deuteronomy 21: 14, a statute may be found, that clearly implies the divine recognition of this right. But time would fail me to specify a *tithe* of the modes in which a man may, by the law of Nature, be invested with an indubitable moral right to compel another to serve him for life.

It is almost superfluous to say, that, if a man can have this right, he can justly transfer it to another. Hence, if it is lawful to hold slaves on any account whatever, those slaves can be lawfully bought and sold. Nay, more, they can be lawfully born in a state of bondage. Suppose that B is the rightful owner of a female slave, who, in that capacity, gives birth to an infant; lingers a few weeks, months or years, all the time a burden and an expense to her master, and then dies. B nurses the child, feeds it, clothes it, pays doctor's bills, protects it personally, and pays taxes to the government for its protection as well as for his own.

All this he does and is legally bound to do, although he may have no hope of remuneration even to the value of a single cent, and may besides be burdened with the support of that child during the whole period of a long and sickly life. When the child has been thus raised to maturity, tell me, I pray you, *has B a natural right to its service* (a right which Wayland concedes even to the parent over his own child) “for so long a period as may be sufficient to secure an adequate remuneration” for the cost of raising, and for all the incidental liabilities and responsibilities, of which we have spoken, superadded? If he has not, it will hardly be affirmed by any but a madman, that he has any right to the labor of his hands expended in the raising of a horse, an ox, or a crop of grain.

But this case is too plain to admit of an argument. Now, it is admitted by intelligent men generally, that this compensation would be more than his market value, the only fair test of his *real* value as a slave, i. e., the exchangeable value of his service for *life*. Hence it has passed very generally into an adage, that slave labor is the dearest sort of labor; in other words, that the *compensation* which slaves receive for their services, all things considered, is much greater than what is generally paid for the same amount of labor performed by *hired* servants. Of the truth of this adage I have myself no doubt.

From the foregoing reflections, it is evident, that it would be difficult to conceive a more absurd and indefensible position than the vaunted dogma of abolitionists and free-soilers, viz., that slavery is opposed to natural rights, and can subsist only by virtue of the *lex loci*. The very opposite of this is true. Right of property in slaves, if it exist at all, must exist in pursuance of, and in harmony with, *natural rights*. It never has been created, and never can be created rightfully, by local law. NOR CAN LOCAL LAW RIGHTFULLY IMPAIR IT. It existed in this country, in its most perfect form, long before the States, as such, or the United States, came into existence. All that the constitutions and laws of the several States did in this matter, was to *recognize, regulate* and *protect* the pre-existing right. They *did not* originate or create it. This is all they did, and all that local law can rightfully do.

Slavery, then, is a relation rightfully subsisting between moral agents, and it is self-evidently absurd to *identify* that relation with *soil*. Hence there is just as little sense, and as much nonsense, in talking about *free soil* and *slave soil*, as there is in talking about *debtor soil* and *creditor soil*, parental soil and filial soil, married soil and bachelor soil, drunken soil and sober soil, or learned soil and ignorant soil.

Now, if it be admitted, as we think has been clearly proved, that slavery is a relation rightfully subsisting between moral agents, it follows necessarily, that the relation having once been estab-

lished *anywhere*, exists as a matter of course *everywhere*; and its obligations, like those of any other moral relation, may be rightfully enforced wherever the parties may be found, until it comes legitimately under the control of a sovereignty by which it is prohibited. This, too, will account for the fact already stated, that it never has been established by local law; and that the first legislation on the subject of slavery, everywhere, merely recognized and affirmed pre-existing rights. Nothing more was necessary where the relation was *properly* understood.

The provision of the Constitution of the United States, for the restitution of fugitive slaves, fully recognizes this principle:—
“No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor shall be due.”

Here we have not merely a full recognition of the correctness of the principle aforesaid, but also a positive compact between the sovereign States, that each will respect the relation, even on its own soil, although it may have prohibited it between its own subjects.

Has Congress, then, the power to exclude slavery from the territories? This question naturally resolves itself into two others, viz: What power can government, abstractly considered, rightfully exercise over property? and, 2d. What power, in this respect, has been specially given to Congress?

In this enlightened age, among those whose opinions are entitled to consideration, there is but little, if any, difference with respect to the fundamental principles of the social compact. All admit, that human government is, in its very nature, an abridgment of natural liberty, and can be justified only on the ground of its necessity; but, at the same time, it is universally conceded that human government is indispensably necessary to protect its subjects from the wrongs which self-willed man is constantly liable to commit on the person, property and character of his brother man.

The principles, which lie at the very basis of this whole subject may be comprehensively stated in the following propositions, which may be justly regarded as self-evident truths, viz:

1. That God wills the existence and happiness of the human race, and, by necessary consequence, whatever is indispensable to the attainment of these ends.

2. That these objects can not be secured, unless rights are protected, and wrongs redressed.

3. That this protection of rights and redress of wrongs can not be had, in a degree commensurate with the necessities of our race, without social organization, *alias* human government.

4. And, therefore, that we have the same evidence, that God

wills human government for the *protection* of all the *rights*, and the *redress* of all the *wrongs* of its subjects, as we have, that he wills the existence and happiness of the human race.

Now, if these self-evident truths be admitted, it follows incontestably, that human government, in the nature of things, neither has, nor can have any power, except for protection of rights, and redress of wrongs.

The inviolability of *private* rights, therefore, that of property included, lies at the very basis of the social compact. Consequently, government has no more right to take a single dollar of private property, except so far as may be necessary for its support and for the accomplishment of its lawful ends, than the highwayman has to take the traveler's purse. Hence it can not *create* right of property in slaves, nor can it *impair* it, where it already exists.

I admit that government has, and must have, the right to take private property, where it is necessary that it be thus taken for the accomplishment of its lawful ends; but not even then has it a right to take private property for the public good without full compensation to the owner. Deny this, and you make government but despotism, and liberty but a name.

This inviolability of the right of private property extends to right of property in slaves as really as in any thing else. Hence, if an individual has a just claim to the service of another—whether for a period of *years*, as in the case of an apprentice—or for *life*, as in the case of a slave—government can not possibly have a right to impair that claim. To concede such a right to government, would be to subvert the very purpose for which, and for which *alone*, God wills its existence.

If a political community, or State, considers domestic slavery incompatible with its prosperity, it has an indubitable right, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to cancel that institution; *provided*, however, that it make full compensation to the owners for the slaves thus emancipated. Without such compensation, government has no more right to emancipate a single slave than the robber has to the purse or to the life of his victim.

Even the monarchy of Great Britain in effect fully recognized this principle in the emancipation of her West India colonies, by making partial compensation for the slaves thus emancipated to the extent of twenty millions sterling, (nearly 100,000,000 of dollars,) which was forty per cent. of their estimated value.

Also, the mongrel republic of Mexico, (a republic in name, but in reality a despotism,) in 1837, fully recognized the correctness of this principle. In that year, the Mexican Congress passed an act (I stop not to inquire by what authority they did it) to abolish slavery. This act, however, provided that the negroes to be emancipated should first be appraised; that government scrip,

payable to their owners for their full value, should be issued, and then the certificate of emancipation should be granted.

In our sister commonwealth of Kentucky, after a most thorough discussion of this whole question, on the stump and through the press, during the campaign of 1849, the Convention affirmed this principle almost by acclamation, and incorporated it in the fundamental law of the State, in words to this effect: "Absolute, arbitrary power, over the lives and property of freemen, exists nowhere in a republic, *not even in its largest majority.*"

The principle is undoubtedly correct, and ought to be explicitly stated in every political constitution.

By way of episode, and to let the audience see the infernal designs of at least some of the leading actors in that movement, I will here introduce a Circular written by T. H. Shreve, Paul Seymour, J. H. Heywood, Noble Butler, F. Crosby, and Wm. H. G. Butler, all of them citizens of Louisville, Kentucky, and addressed to the Editor of the Ripley Bee, a newspaper printed in the State of Ohio. Here is the Circular; let it speak for itself:

EMANCIPATION IN KENTUCKY.

LOUISVILLE, January, 1849.

DEAR SIR:—The people of Kentucky have resolved to hold a Convention for the amendment of the Constitution of the State. In August next delegates to this Convention will be elected. The present movement in this State on the subject of slavery, so deeply interesting to all the friends of emancipation, has reference to this Constitution. It is confidently believed that, if proper exertions are used, the friends of emancipation will succeed in engrafting on the new Constitution some provision by which the State will be relieved from the great evil of African slavery. There is a great demand throughout Kentucky for some practical arguments, showing the moral, social and economical evils of slavery; and we have no doubt that if the friends of emancipation had the means of printing and distributing tracts and newspapers containing such views as are needed, an immense amount of good would be accomplished. So firmly convinced are we of the advantages which would result from printing and circulating, gratuitously, arguments in favor of emancipation adapted to the wants of the people, that we do not hesitate to say that the success of the present movement will probably depend upon the adoption of such a course.

We have no doubt that if the profound interest of the present movement in Kentucky was fully appreciated, all the difficulties in the way of raising the requisite funds for the gratuitous distribution of tracts and newspapers would speedily vanish. If Kentucky breaks up her system of bondage, her example will have a powerful influence on the other slaveholding States. Delaware, Maryland and Missouri would soon rid themselves of slavery, and an agitation would arise in Virginia that would shake that ancient commonwealth to its foundations. Slavery hemmed in by impassable barriers on the South-west, with no new territory on which it could discharge its surplus, and with the present tier of Northern slave States arrayed on the side of freedom, would have a limit to its existence as well as to its extension. How long would it be before the people of the States in which the system would then exist, with all its dark and fearful features greatly aggravated, would call on the General Government for relief?

To all who desire the extinction of African slavery, the present movement in Kentucky commends itself with peculiar force. It affords the only practicable means of affecting the duration of the institution as a National evil. THIS MOVEMENT RISES INTO A NATIONAL IMPORTANCE AND LOSES ITS LOCAL CHARACTER AS WE REGARD IT AS THE FIRST GREAT STEP TOWARDS THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES. WHO, THEN, THAT DESIRES TO SEE OUR COUNTRY REDEEMED FROM THE CURSES OF SLAVERY, WILL NOT BE WILLING TO CONTRIBUTE TO A FUND TO BE APPLIED TO THE

GRATUITOUS CIRCULATION OF TRACTS AND NEWSPAPERS IN KENTUCKY? These documents will necessarily circulate beyond the borders of this State, and have due influence in neighboring slave States, as they will emanate from a slave State, and express views displaying entire familiarity with the subject as it presents itself to those who have been long accustomed to its evils. The arguments, facts and truths that we use will be treasured up and used to prepare the public mind in other States for movements similar to that now in progress in Kentucky.

WE EARNESTLY INVOKE THE SYMPATHY AND AID OF FRIENDS WITHIN BOTH OUR OWN AND OTHER STATES. WE ASK THEM TO COME FORWARD AND CONTRIBUTE TO A FUND WHICH SHALL BE MOST SACREDLY APPLIED TO PRINTING AND GRATUITOUSLY CIRCULATING TRACTS AND NEWSPAPERS CALCULATED TO STRENGTHEN, DEEPEN AND WIDEN THE FEELING IN FAVOR OF EMANCIPATION. We are willing to superintend the preparation and distribution of such documents, and hope that enough persons will be found ready to co-operate with us in this great and glorious work of philanthropy, patriotism and humanity, to place its success beyond peril.

We would especially direct the attention of the friends of emancipation to the Louisville Examiner. This paper, we are satisfied, has been instrumental in doing a great deal of good. If permitted to go out of existence at a period of such profound interest as the present, it would sadden the hearts and the hopes of those who are contending for the removal of slavery from the States; and yet, as the subscription to the paper is unequal to its support, it can be continued only by the assistance of friends. It is of the last importance that "The Examiner" be continued, and that a FUND BE CREATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PRINTING A LARGE NUMBER OF COPIES FOR GRATUITOUS DISTRIBUTION IN EVERY PART OF THE STATE. The non-slaveholders comprise a large portion of the voters of Kentucky, and we are deeply solicitous that they shall be reached by the facts and arguments presented by "The Examiner." What friend of emancipation can refuse to contribute liberally to a work of such magnitude and interest?

THOM. H. SHREVE,
PAUL SEYMOUR,
F. CROSBY,
JOHN H. HEYWOOD,
NOBLE BUTLER,
W. H. G. BUTLER.

N. B.—Contributions forwarded to Rev. J. H. Heywood, Treasurer of our Society, will be reported to the Committee.

You will observe that the authors of the foregoing Circular regarded the emancipation movement in Kentucky "AS THE FIRST GREAT STEP TOWARDS THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES;" that if emancipation then succeeded in Kentucky, the States of "*Delaware, Maryland and Missouri would soon rid themselves* of slavery, and an agitation would arise in Virginia that would shake that ancient commonwealth to its foundations." In that event, say they, slavery "would have a limit to its existence as well as to its extension. How long would it be, before the people of the States in which the system would then exist, with all its *dark and fearful* features greatly aggravated, would call on the general government for relief?"

Who is ignorant of the fact, that Northern abolitionists glory in avowing publicly that they are actuated by the same treasonable and hellish designs, in their efforts to abolitionize Kansas, and thus plant a colony of *negro-thieves* on our Western border.

Believing the scheme of emancipation then advocated to be

nothing else than a barefaced system of public robbery, and that its success would *inevitably* and *speedily* result in a dissolution of the Union,—at the call of my fellow-citizens, and impelled alike by piety and patriotism, at the risk of reputation and even life itself, I threw all my energies of soul, body and spirit into the campaign, and did what I could, whether much or little, to save the Constitution and the Union from the imminent peril to which they were then exposed. The glorious results of that campaign, soul-cheering to every true patriot, are before the country. The assaults of anti-slavery fanaticism were beaten back, the rights of slaveholders defended, and the sacred guarantees of the Constitution triumphantly vindicated.

During its progress, and immediately after its close, the most malignant threats of vengeance were made against me by emancipation leaders, whose unholy and ambitious schemes I had aided to defeat. A fiendish system of wholesale lying and defamation, publicly and privately, was immediately set on foot, and has continued, with but little abatement, to the present time. Anonymous and lying assaults were made upon me in the emancipation organ in Kentucky, and promptly republished in Missouri, in filthy sheets, which self-respect forbids me to name. This was done before I had ever set foot on Missouri soil.

The wholesale lying and slander with which I have been persecuted since my arrival in Missouri by the entire phalanx of abolition and free-soil leaders, and by the filthy lying sheets identified with them in interest and sympathy, whether *political* or *religious*, some of which seem to be incapable of telling the truth when a lie can be made to serve their purpose,—these things multitudes of my fellow-citizens well know, and can truly attest.

I leave you to judge how far these fiendish efforts to destroy my reputation, and to prostrate the State University, over which I have the honor to preside, were prompted by a spirit of revenge for the part I then acted—a conviction that abolitionism and free-soilism could get no foothold in the University so long as I *presided* over its destinies, and an apprehension that the part which I acted in Kentucky in 1849, I would act over again in Missouri should a similar emergency ever occur.

If they regard me as at all in their way, I commend the cunning and the untiring zeal, which they manifest to compass my assassination—so far, at least, as reputation is concerned, which, to an honorable and sensitive man, is often dearer than life itself. But I fear them not. I hurl proud defiance in the viper teeth of Abolitionism, and the motley crew of his abettors and sympathizers; and I assure them, one and all, that, should the day arrive, when my labors shall be needed in Missouri as they were in Kentucky in 1849, I shall, without a moment's hesitation, draw the sword of the Spirit—a *true* Damascus blade as was ever forged in the armory of *Heaven*—and I shall neither ask nor give quar-

ter till the battle is fought, and the victory won, or the friends of the Constitution and the rights of the South lie buried in the common grave, that entombs the liberties of our country. To God Most High, and under him to the general intelligence, virtue and patriotism of my fellow-citizens, do I most cheerfully commit my reputation. My motto this: "The Lord will defend the right."

But, to return from this digression, we have seen that *protection*, not *plunder*, being the only lawful object of government, no matter what may be its form, it follows of necessity that were the government of the United States a consolidated despotism, even then it could not possibly have the right to violate a vested right of property. And if, as we have seen, right of property in slaves is sanctioned by the light of Nature, the Constitution of the United States, and the clear teaching of the Bible, a deliberate and persistent violation of that right, even by government, is as villainous as highway robbery; and, when peaceable modes of redress are exhausted, IS A JUST CAUSE OF WAR BETWEEN SEPARATE STATES, AND OF REVOLUTION IN THE SAME STATE.

Proclaim it aloud, then, in the hearing of my enemies; publish it, if you please, to the ends of the earth, that I have said it;—and if this be treason, let free-soil traitors and abolition negro-thieves, leagued with British tories in an unholy conspiracy to dissolve the Union, make the most of it.

But the government of the United States is not a consolidated central despotism, although many who glory in the name of American, whilst they dishonor that name, seem to think so. On the contrary, it is that of a federal republic, having no powers whatever except what its creators, the States, expressly granted in the Constitution, and which are "*necessary and proper*" to carry the granted powers into effect.

If, therefore, it would be wholly inadmissible for even a despotism to impair a vested right of property in any thing, slaves included, much more so would it be for Congress. Hence, any interpretation, of any part of the Constitution, which claims this power for Congress, is manifestly absurd, abolishes at a single stroke all constitutional restraints upon its authority, makes it despotic in the highest sense possible, and gives it powers, that not even a despotism can rightfully exercise.

I am well aware, that the foregoing principles, if correct, place in a very unenviable light the notorious *three thousand New England clergymen*, who sent the anti-Nebraska memorial to the Senate last year, notwithstanding their implied claim of superior merit as *Protestants*. The friends of the South will do well to remember this fact. If truth, so important to be known and understood by the public, should cast discredit even on *Protestant* clergymen, I see no reason why it should be concealed on that account. It will require better authority than that of even *three*

thousand fanatical Protestant clergymen to convince any reasonable man, that Congress possesses the power to prohibit slavery in the Territories.

But some imagine that Art. 4, Sec. 3, clause 2, gives Congress the power to abolish slavery in the Territories, and exclude it therefrom. This clause reads thus: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

On this I remark, that the power here granted is limited expressly to the *disposal* of the territory as *property*, and to the making of "all needful rules and regulations" for that end. The word "*other*," qualifying *property* in this clause, is undoubtedly nonsensical and absurd, unless territory in this connexion is contemplated as property; the words "*other property*" necessarily implying at least a *second class* of property, which can not possibly be any thing else than "*territory*" immediately preceding. And, therefore, before it can be admitted, that this clause gives Congress the power to exclude slavery from the Territories, it must be shown, that the possession of this power by Congress is absolutely necessary for the disposal of the territory regarded as public property.

Again: Whatever power this clause gives to Congress, extends in all its length and breadth to all the *territory* and *public property* belonging to the United States. Not a single acre of land, or dollar's worth of property, is excepted. If, therefore, by virtue of this clause, Congress has power to abolish slavery in the Territories, and exclude it therefrom, it has the very same right to erect on every acre of land that it owns, within the limits of the slave States, an asylum for British Tories and abolition negro-thieves. The conclusion is irresistible.

But who can believe that the framers of the Constitution intended to give Congress this monstrous power? What inhabitant of a slave State, who has fairly and fully examined the subject, can advocate it, unless identified, at least in sympathy, with the abolitionists? And when the advocates of this pernicious political heresy have accomplished, in their own estimation, this marvelous exploit of logical legerdemain, what have they proved? Why, simply, that the Constitution confers on Congress a power, the exercise of which, even in a despotism, would, as we have clearly seen, be a just cause of revolution.

Missourians! beware, as you would of the viper's deadly fang, of the upas influence of those men, whether *native* or *naturalized*, who exert their ill-gotten influence, and exhaust all their powers of argumentation and sophistry, to convince you that the *power* question is an *immaterial* issue; who, instead of warning

their fellow-citizens of the fearful and impending danger to which they are exposed, and laboring to arouse and unite them as one man in a manly and determined resistance to the common enemy, *traitor-like*, raise the wolf-howl of nullification, secession, disunion, against the best, the most loyal, the *only true* friends of the Constitution—men who, at every hazard, would protect it against the assaults of despotism. Can any plan be conceived by which they could more successfully promote the schemes of abolition traitors than by this parricidal course, laboring to divert the attention of the South from their real danger, and making a pretended love for the Union a masked battery, from which to co-operate more effectively with its only real enemies, for its speedy and everlasting overthrow?

It should never be forgotten, that no government *is*, or *ought to be*, esteemed among men, except for its capacity, *supposed* or *real*, to protect the rights, and redress the wrongs of its subjects. When any government becomes either too weak, or too wicked, to perform this duty, wise men will gladly exchange it, though nominally a republic, for any other form of government, though nominally a despotism, that may be necessary to secure the aforesaid objects. And when a government, instituted solely for protection and redress, becomes itself an instrument of oppression and plunder, and all reasonable hope that it can be reformed is lost, in that event revolution (peacefully, if possible—but at the bayonet's point and cannon's mouth, if necessary) becomes one of the highest and most patriotic duties, that a moral and intelligent community can have to perform. In such a case, "*resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.*" In this country, at least, the Declaration of Independence has canonized this sentiment in the heart of every true patriot. "When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them [any community] under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

This sentiment of our revolutionary heroes and patriots is undoubtedly correct; and no man calling himself American, whether native or naturalized, unless he be a tory or a traitor, will call it in question; much less will he strive to render its advocates odious by stigmatizing them with opprobrious epithets.

Were the government of the United States, then, even a consolidated despotism, the usurpation by it of a power to impair or abolish right of property in slaves, in any place on earth, to which its authority under the Constitution extends, would be a just cause of revolution.

And can any sane man imagine, that the usurpation of such despotic power by a very limited government, which the sovereign States created "*to provide for the COMMON DEFENCE,*" will not be resisted at all hazards, and to the utmost extent, by

more than six millions of American freemen, inhabiting fifteen sovereign States of this Union, whose property to the extent of two thousand millions, and whose very lives, are put in jeopardy by this usurpation? Believe it not, fellow-citizens. The advocate of a doctrine so self-evidently absurd is not to be trusted.

The framers of the Constitution were not so insane as to grant to Congress this despotic power. They affirm with unmistakable plainness, that the powers not granted, or "necessary and proper" to carry into effect the granted powers, are withheld. This power has neither been granted, nor can it be shown that it is "necessary and proper" to carry into effect any one of the granted powers. By logical necessity, therefore, it follows, that it has been withheld. If it has not, it is absurd to call our government one of limited powers. In such circumstances, it would be impossible to conceive a more absolute despotism.

In the present alarming crisis, then, what should be done to beat back the aggressions of anti-slavery fanaticism, and thus, if possible, prevent a dissolution of the Union, or a result still more to be dreaded?

The friends of the Constitution and of the constitutional rights of the South should unite as one man, forgetting all other party issues; and let our enemies see how vain is their hope, that domestic traitors, in disguise, can succeed in keeping us warring upon each other on account of exploded and comparatively insignificant party issues, that they may thus, at an unexpected moment, deliver us up an easy prey into the hands of our enemies.

Regard the man, who would even counsel such division, as an enemy, a second Arnold, an emissary of the unholy alliance between England, France and New England abolitionists.

By their fruits ye shall know them. It is not to be expected that any man in a slave State will acknowledge himself an abolitionist, or an emissary of abolitionists, any more than that Benedict Arnold, while commander of a stronghold, which he designed, at the first opportune moment, to surrender to the British, would acknowledge, that he had been bribed by British gold. Such an acknowledgment, if it did not endanger their persons, would at least in a great measure destroy their capacity for mischief.

They must be judged by their acts. If they labor to weaken the South by keeping alive the foul demon of party spirit; if they are ready to palliate the aggressions of the negro-thieves, and the States and parties by which they are sustained; if they are prompt to exaggerate and denounce the measures of necessary self-defence that an injured and exasperated community may be compelled to take in providing new guards for their future security; and, especially, if they denounce by opprobrious epithets those, whose only alleged offence is too great devotion to the constitutional rights of the South,—you neither need, nor can get, better evidence of their complicity with our enemies.

Good men, especially such as have not thoroughly examined the Bible on this subject, may honestly think, that slaveholding is sinful, and it would be an outrage to interrupt them on account of this opinion. Again: A *bona fide* settler in Kansas (of course I do not mean a paid agent of abolitionism, whether a pauper, or a felon, from New England or Old England) may really believe that it his duty to vote to make Kansas a free State, having proper regard meanwhile to the rights of slaveholders; and for such opinion and vote he ought not to be interrupted.

But the practical abolitionist, who labors to impair a vested right of property in slaves, is a *negro-thief*. And a negro-thief should be regarded and treated as a horse-thief, a burglar, or any other sort of thief; and those who give them aid and comfort should be regarded and treated as their accomplices in guilt. An organized band of such persons, and for such ends, should be treated as an organized band of conspirators against the lives and property of the citizens, enemies alike to God and man; and, therefore, slaveholding communities have just the same right to take all *necessary measures of defence*, whether legal or extra legal, judicial or extra judicial, against a negro thief, or an organized band of negro thieves, as they have a right to take, and are universally acknowledged to have a right to take, against horse thieves, or house-thieves.

The man, therefore, who, in point of law and morals, puts the man who is robbed on a par with the robber—him who “agitates the subject of slavery in Congress or elsewhere,” for the defence of vested rights, on a par with him who agitates for the violation of those rights,—must necessarily have either a *very weak head*, or a *very bad heart*; and, in either case, is wholly unfit to be trusted, especially in a slaveholding community. It was mainly for this cause that, in the late Kansas meeting in Columbia, I objected to the passage of (what are called) Switzler’s Resolutions by themselves. Those resolutions, in the main, contain excellent sentiments, which I most heartily endorse, and, as I then stated, are susceptible of such an interpretation throughout as would be unexceptionable. Hence I was willing to vote in mass for both sets, as the second would contain the necessary explanation and interpretation of the first; but, without that explanation, I could not begin to vote for the 6th Resolution, because it was easily susceptible of an interpretation that made no distinction between agitation on the part of slaveholders *in necessary self-defence*, and the aggressive agitation of abolitionists and negro-thieves: and I asked barely ten minutes to show that such a sentiment was dark as Erebus, and replete with lurking treason to the South.

For the foregoing reasons, too, I approbate, adopt, and endorse with my whole heart the doctrine of Lee’s Resolutions, as follows:

DR. LEE'S RESOLUTIONS.

WHEREAS, it is indubitable that God wills the existence and happiness of the whole human family; that the capacity of the races respectively, and of the successive generations of those races, are adapted to the several spheres they are designed to fill; that their existence and happiness can not be secured without the protection of rights, and redress of wrongs; and that this protection and redress can not be secured in any degree commensurate with our necessities without social organization, which organization must necessarily be adapted to the moral and intellectual condition of those for whom it is intended: Therefore,

Resolved, That human government exists in accordance with the will of God, (and by the consent of the governed if they are morally and intellectually qualified for self-government,) for the protection of the rights and the redress of the wrongs of its subjects, deriving all its just powers from its necessity for, and its adaptation to, the accomplishment of these purposes.

Resolved, That to resist government in the accomplishment of its lawful objects, and the exercise of its just rights, or to subvert its authority when directed to these ends, is highly criminal, and destructive of the best interests of society and the human family.

Resolved, That when any government, from whatever cause, is incapable of protecting the rights and redressing the wrongs of its subjects, it is their inalienable right, both as individuals and as communities, and it is their duty, to take protection and redress into their own hands, and to provide all necessary guards for their future security.

Resolved, That, in accordance with these principles, all communities, whether savage or civilized, admit the right of necessary self-defence, and the consequent right of abating, by extra-legal means, such nuisances as are intolerable and can not be abated by regular operations of law.

Resolved, That the fanatical and persevering efforts of Abolitionists and Abolition Societies to render our slave property insecure, and to excite the evil passions of those slaves to insubordination, has a direct tendency to incite them to servile war, with all its attendant horrors; and is such an invasion of our rights, that we feel justified in pledging our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, to each other, to the State, and to our sister slave States, that we will ABATE IT, to the utmost extent of our ability, peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.

Resolved, That the repeated invasion of the constitutional rights of the slave States, has a direct tendency to dissolve the Union, and, if persisted in, must inevitably lead to this deplorable result, as the only refuge from impending evils of the most appalling and intolerable character; and we therefore pledge ourselves, irrespective of all previous party ties, to abjure all minor issues, and unite as one man in waging a deadly war on abolitionism, and resisting all its vile efforts, whether made by force or fraud, to trample our constitutional rights under its unhallowed feet.

Resolved, That we appeal to the intelligence, patriotism and loyalty of the free States, to arrest the torrent of abolition fanaticism that is sweeping over them in open violation of our constitutional rights, exposing the Union of these States to imminent peril, and if not speedily arrested, to certain annihilation.

Resolved, That the whole State is identified in interest and sympathy with the citizens on our Western border; and we will co-operate with them in all proper measures to prevent the foul demon of Abolitionism from planting a colony of negro-thieves on our frontier to harass our citizens and steal their property, it matters not whether that colony be im-

ported from European poor-houses and prisons, or from the pestilential hot-beds of New England fanaticism.

Resolved, That we regard the emissaries of Abolitionism, whether open or disguised, as our vilest enemies—conspirators against the peace and permanency of our Union, and as such we feel bound to give them no countenance nor encouragement whatever, but on the contrary, as it is our duty in self-defence, we will use all lawful and proper means to expose them to a just retribution, and a lawful and well merited infamy.

Resolved, That as we believe the Missouri Compromise to have been at variance with the spirit and objects of the federal compact, in which are conferred all the powers of the General Government, we most heartily approve of the repeal of that most odious measure, and as cordially endorse the Kansas-Nebraska bill, believing its principles to be correct. We, therefore, have seen with feelings of indignation and abhorrence the efforts made by citizens of free States to deprive slaveholders of the rights which the Kansas bill was designed to restore; and while we deprecate the necessity, we can not too highly appreciate the patriotism of those Missourians who so freely gave their time and money for the purpose, in the recent election in Kansas, of neutralizing said abolition efforts, and preventing the fraud attempted by the importation of hireling voters into that Territory.

Resolved, That the other counties in the State be requested to hold meetings and express their sentiments on the subject, so that whatever hopes may be entertained by the abolitionists of reaping any advantage from division among us, may be dispelled; and that the people of this State, irrespective of all party considerations, may present an unbroken front of opposition to the foul designs of the abolitionists.

Resolved, That we view with indignation the efforts made in Congress as well as in the Northern States to repeal or render inoperative the Fugitive Slave Law, and that we will not submit to the repeal.

Resolved, That delegates be appointed to represent this meeting in the Convention to be held in Boonville, and that the Chairman make the appointment.

These, fellow-citizens, are my sentiments, politically, legally, morally, constitutionally. I endorse them, as already said, with my whole heart.

Standing on this platform, I desire to be a real, bona fide know-nothing; not caring to inquire whether a man, who is sound on this question, be whig or democrat, native citizen or naturalized. All I ask is, that he be loyal to the Constitution, and the constitutional rights of the South. If, then, the Union is to be saved, the South must not allow themselves to be divided, weakened and betrayed by domestic traitors, no matter to what extent she may have previously secured their confidence; but, on the contrary, must combine all their forces in one compact and serried host, and present an unbroken front in defence of their constitutional rights, and in unyielding opposition to Northern aggressions.

I am fully satisfied, had the South been thus united for the last thirty years, the foul fiend of Abolitionism would long ere this have been crushed by the intelligence and patriotism of the free States. So long as we are divided among ourselves, and are war-

ring on each other rather than on the common enemy, we give aid and comfort to the anti-slavery feeling in the North; and thus help, though unintentionally, to crush those patriotic and noble spirits in that section, who have hitherto rallied to the defence of the Constitution, and the rights of the South. We owe these noble spirits a united and unfaltering support. We must have Northern votes in Congress, or a dissolution of the Union is inevitable. And I, for one, am bold to avow, that I am unalterably opposed to disunion, until it is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, that an anti-slavery majority in the North has *permanently resolved to trample under foot the constitutional rights of slaveholders*. We owe it, then, to ourselves as well as to our generous, noble and patriotic friends in the non-slaveholding States, to be united among ourselves; and to repudiate, as traitors and abolition emissaries, all who labor to divide, weaken and betray the South by keeping alive party spirit.

The abolitionists have madly sworn, and confirmed their treasonable oaths by acts no less treasonable—by judicial decisions, legislative acts, forcible resistance to the Constitution and laws of the Union, and repeated murder of officers employed in their execution—that the fugitive slave law shall be repealed or nullified; that slavery shall be abolished in the District of Columbia and in the Territories; that Kansas shall never come into the Union as a slave State; that no more slave States shall ever be added; that they will steal our slaves at pleasure, resisting the Constitution and laws for their delivery to service, and maltreating their owners and the public officers, who may go in their pursuit; and that they will never cease till they have abolished slavery in all the States, or dissolved the Union.

With the South, then, thus driven to the wall, the present struggle is obviously one of life or death. We can retreat no farther, and it would be infinitely *more horrible than death* TO SUCCEED.

The fanatics have already driven us to the very brink of the precipice; and if they persist in the execution of their unholy and treasonable designs, and are not speedily crushed by the intelligence and patriotism of the free States, *where alone it can be done*, who so blind as not to see, that the Union will inevitably and speedily be dissolved! And who in the South so craven, so lost to manly impulse, so very a traitor, as to advise or desire, that the slave States should take no vigorous measures of even *necessary self-defence*, until they are completely wound up in the anaconda folds of this deadly serpent, and crushed, without the power of even a feeble resistance! The free States, if they choose, can elect an abolition President. The legislative balance of power in the Senate has been lost by the introduction of California as a free State, while it is obvious, that the salvation of the Union may depend on its restoration; and if the intelligence and

patriotism of the North are not brought to the rescue in this fearful crisis, what have the fifteen slave States, with more than six millions of free citizens, to depend on, but their own brave hearts, and strong arms?

Thank Heaven, they have *all the courage, more than twice the numbers, and at least twenty times the resources*, that our revolutionary sires had, when they defied the haughty tyrant George the Third, and, after a protracted struggle, drove his menial cohorts off the soil, that had been polluted by their unholy tread.

It is, therefore, vain to imagine, it is suicidal to hope, that such a people will submit to a worse tyranny in that government, which they themselves created for the "*common defence*," and which they could not have been induced to create at all, and CAN NOT NOW BE FORCED TO TOLERATE, FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, be united, be vigilant. Let us husband our resources, concentrate our energies, and exhaust all peaceable means to protect our rights, and save the Union, if possible, from the Vandal assaults of abolition traitors and nullifiers. Let us hope for the best, and prepare for the worst; and then, *having done all that men can do to save the Union*, if a dissolution is forced upon us by domestic traitors, instigated thereto by the decrepid monarchies of the Old World, then I, for one, say, in the language of a distinguished Georgia statesman and patriot, "*having exhausted the argument, we will stand to our arms*;" our motto this, "God will defend the right!" and our consolation, that, *if Rome must fall*, we are innocent.

